

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 19-21, and 26 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-11, 13, 15-17, 19-21, and 23-26 are pending.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 10, 11, 13, 15-17, 19-21, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over I'Anson, further in view of Park and Shanklin. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 1, neither I'Anson, nor Park, nor Shanklin, either singly or in combination, teaches or suggests “expressing a plurality of invalid transitions from the first state to the invalid state as a plurality of regular expressions, the plurality of invalid transitions being direct transitions from the first state to the invalid state.” Specifically, neither I'Anson nor Shanklin teaches invalid transitions from a first valid state to an invalid state. Although Park teaches an “INVALID” state, Park does not teach expressing any invalid transition from a valid state to the invalid state as a regular expression. Further, Park’s cache states show only a single direct transition wherever a first valid state (such as “READ ONLY” or “READ WRITE”) enters the INVALID state (See Park FIG. 2), and not a plurality of invalid transitions from the first state to the invalid state wherein the plurality of invalid transitions are direct transitions from the first state to the invalid state. Thus, the prior art references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations when combined. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-11, 13, 15-17, and 23-26 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Similarly, with respect to claims 19-21, neither I'Anson, nor Park, nor Shanklin, teaches a plurality of invalid transitions being direct transactions from the first state to the invalid state. As such, claims 19-21 are believed to be allowable.

Moreover, with respect to claim 25, neither I'Anson, nor Park, nor Shanklin, either singly or in combination, teaches that “the plurality of invalid transitions correspond to a plurality of disallowed security events.” As discussed above, the prior art references do not teach a plurality of invalid transitions. Further, the references do not teach the correspondence of a plurality of

invalid transitions to a plurality of disallowed security events. As such, claim 25 is believed to be allowable.

With respect to claims 26, neither I'Anson, nor Park, nor Shanklin, either singly or in combination, teaches "in the event that the packet is associated with one of the plurality of invalid transitions, the method further comprising performing error handling based on a disallowed security event that corresponds to said one of the plurality of invalid transitions." As discussed above, the prior art references do not teach a plurality of invalid transitions, or that a disallowed security event corresponds to one of the plurality of invalid transitions. The references, therefore, do not teach performing error handling based on a disallowed security event that corresponds to one of the plurality of invalid transitions. As such, claim 26 is believed to be allowable.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 4/27/07



Diana Y. Fu  
Registration No. 52,924  
V 408-973-2593  
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP  
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200  
Cupertino, CA 95014